

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

DONALD EDWARDS and ANNIE BROOKS,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.) No. 06 C 3110
)
OFFICERS ROGOWSKI, NEGRON,) Judge Joan Lefkow
SHANKLE, JOHN DOE, JOHN SKOE,) Magistrate Judge Soat Brown
JANE DOE AND THE VILLAGE OF)
MELROSE PARK, A MUNICIPAL)
CORPORATION,)
) Trial Date: 2/25/08
Defendants.)

**MOTION IN LIMINE TO BAR TESTIMONY REGARDING PRIOR "GOOD"
CONDUCT OF OFFICERS**

NOW COMES Plaintiffs, DONALD EDWARDS and ANNIE BROOKS, by and through their attorneys, Angela Locket and Standish E. Willis, of the Law Office of Standish E. Willis, and Brendan Shiller, with the instant motion in limine, and in support states as follows:

Background

All Defendants claim to not have any disciplinary records. All defendants, other than Schankle, claim to never have been sued for a civil rights violation. All defendants will presumably claim that they have never falsely arrested or beaten any one.

Claims by Defendants that they have never falsely arrested or beaten other people, and that they have no disciplinary complaints, and have not been

sued previously are not admissible under FRE Rule 402 and FRE Rules 404 and 405(b).

What conduct Defendants have taken in other arrests is simply irrelevant to the conduct alleged here. See FRE Rule 402. There is no Monell claim in this case. The only facts at issue are the facts regarding what occurred on June 23, 2005, and the subsequent trial.

Further, evidence of other specific incidents of good conduct and good character are not admissible unless the character of the defendants is an essential element of the claims or defenses. FRE Rule 405(b); *see United States v. Hill*, 40 F.3d 164, 168 (7th Cir. 1994) (noting that such evidence is generally inadmissible because it is nothing more than an attempt to prove the alleged act did not occur because it was not in conformity with character as proscribed by FRE Rule 404(b)); *see also United States v. Burke*, 781 F.2d 1234, 1243 (7th Cir.1985) (“Evidence that the defendant frequently performs lawful or laudable acts does not often establish that some subsequent act is also lawful or laudable.”).

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff requests an order barring introduction of Defendants’ prior conformity with the law.

Respectfully submitted,

The Law Office of Standish E. Willis

By: s//Angela Lockett
Angela Lockett